This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

❑ **BLACK BORDERS**

❑ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**

❑ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**

❑ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**

❑ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**

❑ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

❑ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**

❑ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**

❑ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**

❑ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.
As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,807	02/05/2001	Devin F. Hosea	109635.134	3995

23483	7590	08/12/2004		

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
60 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER
SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/777,807	HOSEA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Peter J Smith	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 February 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-54</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-54</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 April 2001</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/25/01, 3/1/02, 9/30/02, 4/21/03</u>

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 2/5/2001, formal

drawings filed 4/9/2001, IDS filed on 3/1/2002, IDS filed on 9/30/2002, and IDS filed on

4/21/2003.

2.   Claims 1-54 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 25, 33, 45, 48, and 51 are independent

claims.

Drawings

3.   Figures 1-6 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that

which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawing sheets are required in

reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s)

should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to

obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office

action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   **Claims 1-2, 5, 8, 10, 23-34, 36, 40, 45-49, and 51-54 are rejected under 35**

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Capek, US 6,112,192 filed 5/9/1997.

Regarding independent claim 1, Capek discloses providing a profile of a Web page in

fig. 1 and col. 3 lines 31-59. This profile is the original HTML file. Capek discloses providing a

profile of a user in fig. 1 and col. 3 line 60 – col. 4 line 4. This profile is contained in the

customer profile database. Capek discloses producing a modified Web page based on the profile

of the Web page and the profile of the user in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 –

col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. The producing of the modified Web page is

performed at the content customization step, which is shown in detail in fig. 3.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Capek discloses that the profile of the user includes

demographic data in fig. 5 and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Capek discloses that the profile of the user includes

psychographic data in fig. 5 and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Capek discloses that the profile of the user includes

geographic data in fig. 5 and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Capek discloses providing Web page content matching

the geographic data of the user profile in fig. 5 and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Capek discloses including a content component, the

profile of the Web page associating the content component with demographic data, and

producing a modified Web page including the step of matching the profile of the user to the

demographic data for the content component in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3

line 31 – col. 4 line 4, col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13, and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 24, Capek discloses including a content component, the profile of the Web page associating the content component with psychographic data, the step of producing a modified Web page including the step of matching the profile of the user to the psychographic data for the content component in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13, and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding independent claim 25, Capek discloses obtaining the HTML file for a Web page, the HTML file including one or more content components in fig. 1 and col. 3 lines 31-59. Capek discloses providing a profile of a user in fig. 1 and col. 3 line 60 – col. 4 line 4. The user profile includes a classification scheme including one or more categories as shown in fig. 5. Capek discloses parsing the HTML file for the Web page to identify one or more content components in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek discloses associating at least one of the one or more content components with at least one of the one or more categories in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13, and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14. The content component is matched and displayed in the customized Web page according to a match with the user profile.

Regarding dependent claim 26, Capek discloses wherein the one or more categories include demographic categories in fig. 5 and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 27, Capek discloses wherein the one or more categories include psychographic categories in fig. 5 and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 28, Capek discloses associating at least one of the one or more content components with at least one processing instruction in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 2

lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13, and col. 5 line 66 –

col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 29, Capek discloses wherein the classification scheme is

related to a classification scheme for user profiles in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 25-67, and

col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13, and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 30, Capek discloses generating a profile for the Web page

in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, col. 4 line 40 – col. 5

line 13, and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 31, Capek discloses wherein the one or more content

components include key words, the step of associating including using key words in fig. 1, fig. 3,

fig. 5, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13, and col.

5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 32, Capek discloses wherein the content components

includes links, the step of associating including using a URL database in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 5, col.

2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13, and col. 5 line 66 –

col. 6 line 14.

Regarding independent claim 33, Capek discloses providing profiles of a plurality of

Web pages in fig. 1 and col. 3 lines 31-59. These profiles are the original HTML files. Capek

discloses providing profiles of a plurality of users in fig. 1 and col. 3 line 60 – col. 4 line 4. The

profiles are contained in the customer profile database. Capek discloses monitoring requests

from the plurality of users, detecting an individual request for a particular Web page, obtaining

the particular Web page, obtaining a profile for the particular Web page, obtaining a profile for

the individual user, and producing a modified Web page based on the profile for the particular

Web page and the profile for the individual user in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line

31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. The producing of the modified Web page is

performed at the content customization step, which is shown in detail in fig. 3.

Regarding dependent claim 34, Capek discloses dynamically generating the profile for

the particular Web page after detecting an individual request for a particular Web page in fig. 1,

fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13.

Regarding dependent claim 36, Capek discloses tracking click-stream data of the

plurality of users in fig. 5 and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14. Capek shows tracking web use

history in fig. 5.

Regarding dependent claim 40, Capek discloses processing instructions for the

particular Web page, wherein the step of producing a modified Web page further includes

applying the processing instructions for the particular Web page in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-

67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13.

Regarding independent claim 45, Capek discloses obtaining a profile of an individual

user and a profile of a particular Web page in fig. 1 and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4. Capek

discloses detecting a request for a particular Web page by an individual user, producing a

modified Web page based on the profile of the individual user and the profile of the particular

Web page, and sending the modified Web page for delivery to the individual user in fig. 1, fig. 3,

col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. The

producing of the modified Web page is performed at the content customization step, which is

shown in detail in fig. 3.

Regarding dependent claim 46, Capek discloses wherein the computer is a proxy server in col. 5 lines 6-12.

Regarding dependent claim 47, Capek discloses a profiler for producing a profile of the particular Web page in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13.

Regarding independent claim 48, Capek discloses obtaining a profile of an individual user and a profile of a particular Web page in fig. 1 and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4. Capek discloses detecting a request for a particular Web page by an individual user, producing a modified Web page based on the profile of the individual user and the profile of the particular Web page, and sending the modified Web page for delivery to the individual user in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. The producing of the modified Web page is performed at the content customization step, which is shown in detail in fig. 3.

Regarding dependent claim 49, Capek discloses a means for generating a profile of the Web page in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13.

Regarding independent claim 51, Capek discloses a database containing profiles of a plurality of users in fig. 1 and col. 3 line 60 – col. 4 line 4. The profiles are contained in the customer profile database. Capek discloses a database containing profiles of a plurality of Web pages in fig. 1 and col. 3 lines 31-59. Capek discloses a proxy server including a request generation component for processing a received request for a Web page and generating a valid personalization request and a personalization component for personalizing a Web page in

accordance with a profile of the user by generating a modified source file, the proxy server being

linked to the first and second databases in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col.

4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. The proxy server is discloses in col. 5 lines 6-12.

Regarding dependent claim 52, Capek discloses a profiler for producing a profile of the

particular Web page in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col.

4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13.

Regarding dependent claim 53, Capek discloses wherein the proxy server is linked to a

user computer for providing Web access to a user, the proxy server being linked to receive Web

requests of the user and fulfill Web requests of the user in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and

col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13.

Regarding dependent claim 54, Capek discloses wherein the proxy server is capable of

handling Web requests to a plurality of Web sites.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

7.   **Claims 3-4, 6-7, 11-22, 37-39, and 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Capek, US 6,112,192 filed 5/9/1997 in view of Nielsen et al. (hereafter

referred to as Nielsen), US 6,055,542 filed 10/29/1997 and Miyasaka et al. (hereafter

referred to as Miyasaka), US 6,766,362 B1 filed 7/28/2000.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Capek teaches providing a profile of a user in fig. 1, fig. 5, and col. 2 lines 25-67. Capek does not teach making a portion of the Web page content generally matching the demographic data more prominent. Nielsen teaches creating and using a user interest profile which includes data such as relative importance weights in the abstract. Nielsen teaches presenting customized information to a user in a sorted order according the weighted interest profile of the user in fig. 4. Miyasaka teaches populating a customized Web page layout with customized information according to an interest profile of a user in fig. 7-8 and col. 8 line 55 – col. 11 line 10. The highest priority areas of the Web page layout are sequentially filled with the highest priority content items based on a match with the user interest profile.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Nielsen and Miyasaka into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the profile weighting and customized sorting of Nielsen as well as the prioritized area content filling of Miyasaka to have modified Capek to have presented the high matching demographic data more prominently to a user so that the customized information of highest interest to the user would have been displayed in the most prominent position on the customized Web page.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Capek teaches providing a profile of a user in fig. 1, fig. 5, and col. 2 lines 25-67. Capek does not teach making a portion of the Web page content generally not matching the demographic data less prominent. Nielsen teaches creating and using a user interest profile which includes data such as relative importance weights in the abstract. Nielsen teaches presenting customized information to a user in a sorted order according the

weighted interest profile of the user in fig. 4. Miyasaka teaches populating a customized Web

page layout with customized information according to an interest profile of a user in fig. 7-8 and

col. 8 line 55 – col. 11 line 10. The highest priority areas of the Web page layout are

sequentially filled with the highest priority content items based on a match with the user interest

profile.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined Nielsen and Miyasaka into Capek to have created the claimed

invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the profile weighting and

customized sorting of Nielsen as well as the prioritized area content filling of Miyasaka to have

modified Capek to have presented the low matching demographic data less prominently to a user

so that the customized information of lesser interest to the user would have been displayed in a

less prominent position on the customized Web page so that the user would have directed their

attention first to content items of higher interest.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Capek teaches providing a profile of a user in fig. 1, fig.

5, and col. 2 lines 25-67. Capek does not teach making a portion of the Web page content

generally matching the psychographic data more prominent. Nielsen teaches creating and using

a user interest profile which includes data such as relative importance weights in the abstract.

Nielsen teaches presenting customized information to a user in a sorted order according the

weighted interest profile of the user in fig. 4. Miyasaka teaches populating a customized Web

page layout with customized information according to an interest profile of a user in fig. 7-8 and

col. 8 line 55 – col. 11 line 10. The highest priority areas of the Web page layout are

sequentially filled with the highest priority content items based on a match with the user interest

profile.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined Nielsen and Miyasaka into Capek to have created the claimed

invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the profile weighting and

customized sorting of Nielsen as well as the prioritized area content filling of Miyasaka to have

modified Capek to have presented the high matching psychographic data more prominently to a

user so that the customized information of highest interest to the user would have been displayed

in the most prominent position on the customized Web page.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Capek teaches providing a profile of a user in fig. 1, fig.

5, and col. 2 lines 25-67. Capek does not teach making a portion of the Web page content

generally not matching the psychographic data less prominent. Nielsen teaches creating and

using a user interest profile which includes data such as relative importance weights in the

abstract. Nielsen teaches presenting customized information to a user in a sorted order according

the weighted interest profile of the user in fig. 4. Miyasaka teaches populating a customized

Web page layout with customized information according to an interest profile of a user in fig. 7-

8 and col. 8 line 55 – col. 11 line 10. The highest priority areas of the Web page layout are

sequentially filled with the highest priority content items based on a match with the user interest

profile.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined Nielsen and Miyasaka into Capek to have created the claimed

invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the profile weighting and

customized sorting of Nielsen as well as the prioritized area content filling of Miyasaka to have

modified Capek to have presented the low matching psychographic data less prominently to a

user so that the customized information of lesser interest to the user would have been displayed

in a less prominent position on the customized Web page so that the user would have directed

their attention first to content items of higher interest.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Capek teaches providing Web page content matching

geographic data in a user profile in fig. 5 and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14. Capek does not

specifically teach that the matching content is new or weather information. Miyasaka does teach

that matching content used to customize a Web page is news or weather information in fig. 5-6.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to have combined Miyasaka and Nielsen into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It

would have been obvious and desirable to have provided news and weather data matching the

geographic data because that is the information that the user matching the geographic data would

have most likely have been interested in.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a

user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and

col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically show rearranging a portion of the

content of the Web page during the customization. Nielsen shows rearranging a portion of the

content of a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 4. Miyasaka teaches

rearranging a portion of the content of a Web page according to a user customization profile in

fig. 7-8 and col. 8 line 55 – col. 11 line 10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Nielsen and Miyasaka into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the rearranging abilities of Nielsen and Miyasaka to have improved Capek so that the most interesting content would have been placed in the most prominent part of the Web page so that the user would have viewed the highest interest content first.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically show rearranging links of the Web page during the customization. Nielsen shows rearranging links of a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Nielsen and Miyasaka into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the link rearranging ability of Nielsen to have improved Capek so that the most interesting links would have been placed in the most prominent part of the Web page so that the user would have viewed the highest interest content first.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically show rearranging a portion of the content of the Web page during the customization. Nielsen shows rearranging a portion of the content including advertisements of a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig.

4. Miyasaka teaches rearranging a portion of the content including advertisements of a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 7-8 and col. 8 line 55 – col. 11 line 10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Nielsen and Miyasaka into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the rearranging abilities of Nielsen and Miyasaka to have improved Capek so that the most interesting advertisements would have been placed in the most prominent part of the Web page so that the user would have viewed the highest interest advertisements first.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically show rearranging images of the Web page during the customization. Nielsen shows rearranging a portion of the content including images of a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 4. Miyasaka teaches rearranging a portion of the content including images of a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 7-8 and col. 8 line 55 – col. 11 line 10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Nielsen and Miyasaka into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the rearranging abilities of Nielsen and Miyasaka to have improved Capek so that the most interesting images would have been placed in the most prominent part of the Web page so that the user would have viewed the highest interest images first.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically show rearranging a portion of the content of the Web page during the customization. Nielsen shows rearranging a portion of the content including text of a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 4. Miyasaka teaches rearranging a portion of the content including text of a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 7-8 and col. 8 line 55 – col. 11 line 10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Nielsen and Miyasaka into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the rearranging abilities of Nielsen and Miyasaka to have improved Capek so that the most interesting text would have been placed in the most prominent part of the Web page so that the user would have viewed the highest interest text first.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically show eliminating a portion of the content of the Web page to produce a modified Web page. Miyasaka teaches wherein the user profile selects a portion of the topics to create the customized Web page. The portions that are not selected by the user profile are eliminated and not displayed to the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Miyasaka and Nielsen into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the portion eliminating feature

of Miyasaka so that the customized Web page would have only displayed content to the user
which was of interest to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a
user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and
col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically show eliminating a portion of the link
content of the Web page to produce a modified Web page. Nielsen teaches rearranging links
according to a weighted user profile in fig. 4. Miyasaka teaches wherein the user profile selects
a portion of the topics to create the customized Web page. The portions that are not selected by
the user profile are eliminated and not displayed to the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention
was made to have combined Nielsen and Miyasaka into Capek to have created the claimed
invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the content elimination of
Miyasaka and the link rearrangement of Nielsen to have eliminated links of low interest in the
customized page of Capek so that links of low interest to the user would not have been presented
to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a
user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and
col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not teach eliminating content of the Web page to
produce a modified Web page. Miyasaka teaches wherein the user profile selects a portion of the
topics to create the customized Web page. The portions that are not selected by the user profile
are eliminated and not displayed to the user. Capek teaches only displaying advertisements
which matches a user profile and not displaying advertisements not matching a user profile.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Miyasaka and Nielsen into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the content elimination of Miyasaka to have modified Capek to have eliminated advertisements of little interest to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 20, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically show eliminating a portion of the image content of the Web page to produce a modified Web page. Miyasaka teaches wherein the user profile selects a portion of the topics to create the customized Web page. The image portions that are not selected by the user profile are eliminated and not displayed to the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Miyasaka and Nielsen into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the image portion eliminating feature of Miyasaka so that the customized Web page would have only displayed content to the user which was of interest to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically show eliminating a portion of the text content of the Web page to produce a modified Web page. Miyasaka teaches wherein the user profile selects a portion of the topics to create the customized Web page. The text portions that are not selected by the user profile are eliminated and not displayed to the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Miyasaka and Nielsen into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the text portion eliminating feature of Miyasaka so that the customized Web page would have only displayed content to the user which was of interest to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically show providing a link on the modified Web page to the eliminated portion of the content of the Web page. Miyasaka does teach providing a link on the modified Web page to the eliminated portion of the content of the Web page in fig. 7 and col. 9 lines 31-37.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Miyasaka and Nielsen into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have provided a link to the eliminated content portions so that the user still would have been able to have accessed those content portions if the user so desired.

Regarding dependent claim 37, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically show rearranging a portion of the content of the Web page during the customization. Nielsen shows rearranging a portion of the content of a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 4. Miyasaka teaches

rearranging a portion of the content of a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 7-8 and col. 8 line 55 – col. 11 line 10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Nielsen and Miyasaka into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the rearranging abilities of Nielsen and Miyasaka to have improved Capek so that the most interesting content would have been placed in the most prominent part of the Web page so that the user would have viewed the highest interest content first.

Regarding dependent claim 38, Capek teaches applying a threshold value to a content affinity rating in the profile of the user in fig. 5 and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 39, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a user customization profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically show eliminating a portion of the content of the Web page to produce a modified Web page. Miyasaka teaches wherein the user profile selects a portion of the topics to create the customized Web page. The portions that are not selected by the user profile are eliminated and not displayed to the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Miyasaka and Nielsen into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the portion eliminating feature of Miyasaka so that the customized Web page would have only displayed content to the user which was of interest to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 41, Capek teaches providing a profile of a user in fig. 1, fig. 5, and col. 2 lines 25-67. Capek does not teach rearranging the content components of the modified Web page content to only or more prominently display components having profiles matching the profile of the individual user. Nielsen teaches creating and using a user interest profile which includes data such as relative importance weights in the abstract. Nielsen teaches presenting customized information to a user in a sorted order according the weighted interest profile of the user in fig. 4. Miyasaka teaches populating a customized Web page layout with customized information according to an interest profile of a user in fig. 7-8 and col. 8 line 55 – col. 11 line 10. The highest priority areas of the Web page layout are sequentially filled with the highest priority content items based on a match with the user interest profile.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Nielsen and Miyasaka into Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the profile weighting and customized sorting of Nielsen as well as the prioritized area content filling of Miyasaka to have modified Capek to have presented the high matching content data more prominently to a user so that the customized information of highest interest to the user would have been displayed in the most prominent position on the customized Web page.

Regarding dependent claim 42, Capek teaches wherein the content component has a hyperlinked subject heading in fig. 5 and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 43, Capek teaches wherein the content component is an advertisement in fig. 5 and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14.

Regarding dependent claim 44, Capek does not specifically teach that the content

component is an article. However, Miyasaka does teach that the content components are articles

in fig. 7-8 and col. 8 line 55 – col. 11 line 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Miyasaka and Nielsen into

Capek to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have

used the article content components of Miyasaka to have produced customized article sets for the

individual user so that the user would have had access to articles of personal interest.

8.   **Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capek, US**

6,112,192 filed 5/9/1997 in view of Nielsen et al. (hereafter referred to as Nielsen), US

6,055,542 filed 10/29/1997 and Miyasaka et al. (hereafter referred to as Miyasaka), US

6,766,362 B1 filed 7/28/2000 as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Linsk, US

6,138,142 filed 12/20/1996.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Capek teaches that the user profile includes geographic

data in fig. 5 and col. 5 line 66 – col. 6 line 14, but does not specifically teach that the geographic

data is inferred from an IP address or a ZIP code. Linsk does teach that geographic data for a

user profile is inferred from an IP address or a ZIP code in fig. 2-4 and col. 3 line 42 – col. 4 line

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to have combined Linsk into Capek in view of Nielsen and Miyasaka to have created the

claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have inferred the geographic

data from a ZIP code or an IP address so that the user would not have had to have inputted

further details about their location. This would have allowed the server to have collected the geographic data in a faster and easier manner.

9.   Claims 35 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capek, US 6,112,192 filed 5/9/1997.

Regarding dependent claim 35, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a user customization profile and a Web page profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically teach generating and caching the profile for the particular Web page before detecting an individual request for the particular Web page. However, Capek does teach that an advantage of performing the customization according to Capek would make possible better caching of the program material.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Capek to have taken advantage of the caching friendly architecture to have cached the profile of the Web page to have accelerated the delivery of the modified Web page to the requesting user. It would have been obvious and desirable to have cached the profiles to reduce the profile retrieval time which in turn reduces the time necessary to produce the modified Web page.

Regarding dependent claim 50, Capek teaches customizing a Web page according to a user customization profile and a Web page profile in fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 2 lines 25-67, and col. 3 line 31 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 4 line 40 – col. 5 line 13. Capek does not specifically teach generating and caching the profile for the particular Web page before detecting an individual

request for the particular Web page. However, Capek does teach that an advantage of

performing the customization according to Capek would make possible better caching of the

program material.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have modified Capek to have taken advantage of the caching friendly architecture

to have cached the profile of the Web page to have accelerated the delivery of the modified Web

page to the requesting user. It would have been obvious and desirable to have cached the

profiles to reduce the profile retrieval time which in turn reduces the time necessary to produce

the modified Web page.

Conclusion

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Isaac et al., US 6,424,981 B1 filed 12/15/1999 discloses customization of network

documents using customization information stored on a server computer. Cragun et al., US

6,161,112 filed 5/19/1998 discloses web page presentation control. Haitsuka et al., US

6,505,201 B1 continuation filed 6/3/1999 discloses monitoring individual internet usage. Kelly

et al., US 6,498,987 B1 filed 4/12/2000 discloses providing personalized weather reports. Kelly

et al., US 6,654,689 B1 filed 11/6/2000 discloses providing personalized storm warnings.

Katariya et al., US 6,564,251 B2 filed 12/3/1998 discloses a scalable computing system for

presenting customized aggregation of information. Anuff et al., US 6,327,628 B1 filed

5/19/2000 discloses a portal server that provides customizable user interface to access computer

networks. Daugherty et al., US 6,345,292 B1 filed 12/3/1998 discloses a web page rendering

architecture. Schneider, US 6,684,217 B1 filed 11/21/2000 discloses generating a profile from which a publication may be created. Murphy, US 6,615,247 B1 filed 7/1/1999 discloses customizing requested web pages based on information such as previous location visited by the customer and search terms used by the customer. Herz, US 6,460,036 B1 filed 12/5/1997 discloses providing customized electronic newspapers and target advertisements. Stemp et al., US 6,401,094 B1 filed 5/27/1999 discloses presenting information in accordance with user preference. Dharap, US 6,256,633 B1 filed 6/25/1998 discloses context-based and user-profile driven information retrieval. Kelley et al., US 6,209,007 B1 filed 11/26/1997 discloses web internet screen customizing. Nehab et al., US 6,029,182 filed 10/4/1996 discloses generating a custom formatted hypertext document by using a personal profile to retrieve hierarchical documents. Hagan et al., US 6,734,886 B1 filed 12/21/1999 discloses customizing a browsing experience on a World-Wide-Web site. Thomas, US 6,128,663 filed 2/10/1998 discloses customization of information content provided to a requestor over a network using demographic information yet the user remains anonymous to the server. Newman et al., US 6,085,229 filed 5/14/1998 discloses providing client side personalization of content of web pages. Makuch et al., US 6,330,592 B1 filed 12/5/1998 discloses displaying pre-customized content associated with visitor data. Cuomo et al., US 6,286,043 B1 filed 8/26/1998 discloses user profile management in the presence of dynamic pages using content templates.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 703-305-5931. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
July 29, 2004

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER